

App. No. 09/698,824
Petition dated 9/21/2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 08/24/2005

Attn. Docket No. VELCP003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action of August 24, 2005, [3-4] Claims 1,3,5-7, 12, 14, 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Long USP 6,240,141; and [5] Claims and Claims 8-10, 19, and 22-23 were indicated to contain allowable subject matter if amended to include the limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. In response to the Final Office Action the Applicant requested a Telephonic Interview with the Examiner, which interview was conducted on September 13 with the Applicant and Examiner Do.

Interview of 9-13-05 discussing Claim 1 in view of the Long Reference

In the interview the Applicant and Examiner discussed limitations in rejected Claim 1, in both the row transform components and the column transform components neither of which limitations singly or in combination are found in the Long reference. The Applicant and Examiner specifically discussed the following limitations found in Independent Claim 1 as follows:

“ *a two-dimensional Fourier transform circuit ... having:*

row transform components ... generating partial row transforms limited to solutions to a single unsolved one of the "R" output nodes of the Radix-R butterfly on each of the "R" iterations through ... each input sample set; and

column transform components ... generate complete column transforms from the partial row transforms... prior to a completion of the "R" iterations through each input sample ... thereby to reduce an interval required to transform each successive input sample set.” (Applicant’s Independent Claim1, emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submitted that the Long reference discloses only the complete processing of all rows in a sample set before beginning column transforms. Such teaching in the Long reference is shown in FIG. 5 and FIG 10 as well as in the specification (Long at col 6, lines 35-45) The Examiner agreed that these limitations were missing in the Long reference and indicated a willingness to withdraw the Long reference. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s reconsideration.

App. No. 09/698,824
Petition dated 9/21/2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 08/24/2005

Attn. Docket No. VELCP003

6-7 CLAIMS 1,3,5-7, 12, 14, 16-18 REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1,3,5-7, 12, 14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Long (U.S. 6,240,141). The Examiner's prior characterization of the Long reference as having "*row transform components generating partial row transforms ... limited to solutions to a single unsolved one of the "R" output nodes of the Radix-R butterfly on each of the "R" iterations ... from each sample set... and column transform components ... configure... to generate complete column transforms... from the partial row transforms ... prior to a completion of the "R" iterations through each sample set...*" (Office Action of 11/18/2004 at page 4 Emphasis added) has been withdrawn as discussed above in reference to Independent Claim 1 discussed in the telephonic interview of 9/13/05 and as summarized in the Examiner's interview summary mailed on 9/16/05.

Specifically the Applicant's limitation in Claim 1 with respect to partial row transforms and the generation of complete column transforms prior to completion of the "R" iterations through each input sample set by the row transform components are not disclosed in the Long specification and therefore are not anticipated by same.

Remaining Independent Claim 12 contains similar limitations as follows:

" generating partial row transforms limited to solutions to a single unsolved one of the "R" output nodes of the Radix-R butterfly on each of "R" iterations through ordered sets of samples from each input sample set ...; and
generating complete column transforms from the partial row transforms ... prior to a completion of the "R" iterations through each input sample set ... thereby to reduce an interval required to transform each successive input sample set from a corresponding one of a time-to-frequency domain and a frequency-to-time domain." (Applicant's Independent Claim 12, emphasis added)

The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection as to Independent Claims 1 and 12. The Applicant also requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections as to remaining rejected Claims 3, 5-7 and 14, 16-18 dependent thereon for the reasons discussed above and for other reasons of independent significance.

App. No. 09/698,824
Petition dated 9/21/2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 08/24/2005

Attn. Docket No. VELCP003

8 CLAIMS 8-10, 19 AND 22 OBJECTED TO:

The Examiner has indicated Claims 8-10, 19 and 22-23 to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of Allowability as to these dependent Claims and trusts that the amendments and arguments advanced herein as to the Independent Claims 1 or 12 from which they depend, will result in their allowance in their current dependent form.

App. No. 09/698,824
Petition dated 9/21/2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 08/24/2005

Attn. Docket No. VELCP003

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, and the amendments to the Claims, Applicant respectfully submits that all remaining Claims 1,3 5-10, 12, 14, 16, 17-19, 22-23 have been placed in a condition for allowance, and respectfully petitions that they be allowed. Early notice to this effect is solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1338 (Docket No. VELCP003).

Respectfully submitted,
IP CREATORS

Charles C. Cary
Registration No. 36,764

Date: September 21, 2005
P.O. Box 2789
Cupertino, CA 95015
Tel: (408) 850-9585
Fax: (408) 850-9585

E-mail: ccrary@ipcreators.com